

REMARKS

Status Summary

Claims 1-48 are pending in the present application, of which claims 1, 16, 31, 46, 47 and 48 are presented in independent form. Claims 1-48 stand rejected. Claims 1-4, 5-8, 10-18, 20-23, 25-32, and 46-48 are amended.

Amendment to the Specification

Applicant has amended paragraph 047 in the specification to correct the item numeral for the described resource management system (RMS). No new matter has been presented.

Amendments to the Claims

Applicant has amended claims 1, 16, 31, 46, 47 and 48 to clarify the claimed inventions. In particular, the claims were amended to incorporate a recited limitation in claims 3 and 18 such that the amended claims now recite "allowing a user to select a specified resource" for which a relation is to be configured. Claims 3 and 18 were amended to remove the limitation of allowing the user to select the specified resource, accordingly. Support for these amendments are found throughout the specification and in the claims. Accordingly, no new matter is presented and a new search is not necessary.

Claims 2, 3, 5-8, 10-15, 17, 18, 20-23, 25-30, and 32 were amended to correct minor typographical and formatting errors. As such, these amendments bear no more than a tangential relationship to the subject matters defined by the amended claims. Accordingly, those interpreting these claims should not limit them to their literal scopes.

Claim Rejection(s) - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,484,162 to Edlund et al. ("Edlund"). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In accordance with the MPEP, anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102, requires that the cited document teach every aspect of the claimed invention, either explicitly or impliedly. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present. The rejections presented in the Office Action cannot stand at least because the cited document fails to teach every aspect of the claimed invention explicitly or implicitly.

The claimed present inventions are directed to systems, methods and a computer readable medium containing program instructions for providing links to one or more resources related to a specified resource. In claim 1, a method is recited that includes allowing a user to select a specified resource for which a relation is to be configured, and allowing the user to configure the relation comprising a matching criteria for the specified resource. The relation is associated with the specified resource and processed to create a relation set. The relation set comprises the links to the related resources that satisfy the matching criteria. Claim 16 is directed to a computer readable

medium containing program instructions for implementing the method of claim 1, and claim 31 is directed to a system that includes a resource management system and a search engine configured to execute the method or program instructions recited in claims 1 and 16, respectively.

In claim 46, a method is recited that includes allowing the user to select a specified resource and to define a set of relationships associated with the specified resource. The set of relationships is utilized to determine the links associated with the related resources. The links are displayed to allow the user to navigate from the specified resource to the related resources by following the associated links. Claim 47 is directed to a computer readable medium that contains program instructions for implementing the method recited in claim 46, and claim 48 is directed to a system that is configured to execute the method in claim 46.

According to aspects of one embodiment, the user is allowed to specify a resource and to configure one or more relationships to associate with that resource. Each configured relationship includes one or more constraints, which collectively form the matching criteria. When the matching criteria is executed by a search engine, links to the resources that satisfy the matching criteria are created and displayed to the user who can use the links to navigate to the related resources. Advantageously, the user is allowed to control the type of resource sought, (e.g., whether the resource to be returned is an image or an album), who has access to the links, and the dynamic nature of the links, (e.g., when or how often the matching criteria is executed).

For example, a user of a photo-sharing website is allowed to automatically discover and manually specify relationships among resources, e.g., images and albums, which enables the site to provide links to related resources. The links can depend on the type of relationship that the user wishes to make available for others or on the type of relationship that the user is interested in. Unlike conventional applications, the user has more flexibility in defining the types of relationships between the specified resource and the related resources. The user is not limited to static categories defined by the system, but rather is free to create constraints from parameters associated with the types of resources sought.

Independent Claims 1, 16, 31, 46, 47 and 48 are Allowable of Edlund.

Applicant respectfully submits that Edlund fails to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations recited in independent claims 1, 16, 31, 46, 47 and 48 of the present invention. Edlund is directed to reusing search queries and sharing database search strategies among users to retrieve documents from a document database. In Edlund, user specified search queries are stored in a search query repository so that they can be searched and retrieved in the future for the user who created the query or for another user and reused. In one aspect, the user submits a query to Edlund's system, which retrieves and returns documents satisfying the query and search queries that are similar to the submitted query. The user can browse the documents, save the submitted query,

and/or select a retrieved similar query for execution against the document database.
(Column 3, line 30 to column 4, line 3).

Applicant respectfully submits that Edlund fails to teach or suggest allowing a user to select "a specified resource" and "associating the relation with the specified resource," as claim 1 requires. According to aspects of the claimed invention, the user is allowed to select a resource, e.g., an image or a photo album, and configure a relation for the resource, and the relation is associated with the resource. The relation can be used to retrieve related resources, e.g., other images or photo albums, that satisfy the matching criteria in the relation. In contrast, Edlund teaches that the user configures a query to retrieve resources, i.e., documents, that satisfy the query and to retrieve stored queries that are similar to the configured query. Nothing in Edlund discloses selecting a specified resource, e.g., document, for which the relation, e.g., query, is to be configured, and associating the relation/query with the specified resource, as recited in claim 1.

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Edlund teaches automatically retrieving and displaying any previously defined relation for the resource in response to the user selecting the specified resource at column 10, lines 25-62, and associating the configured relation with the specified resource at column 8, line 52-column 9, line 65; column 10, line 25 to column 11, line 5. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

At column 10, line 25 to column 11, line 5, Edlund describes using the system to examine a search history for a particular user. The user submits a user ID as well as a

query, e.g., label/description pair, to the system. The system uses the user ID to identify a query history for the person corresponding to the user ID and uses the submitted query to perform a search for queries that are related to the submitted query. The query history and the queries related to the submitted query are integrated and presented to the user.

At column 8, line 52 to column 9, line 65, Edlund describes a label manager component that automatically generates a label and description for the query submitted by the user. The label and description are based on the words and phrases contained in the query, and are associated with the query. The label and description are used to retrieve stored queries that are similar to the submitted query.

Applicant respectfully submits that nothing in the cited portions teach or suggest allowing the user to "select a specified resource" for which a relation is to be configured, and "associating the relation with the specified resource," as recited in claim 1. As described in the specification, resources are stored objects, e.g., user sites, electronic greeting cards, electronic books, movies, music, images and photo albums. (Specification at paragraph 002). The relation is configured for the specified resource, and the relation is associated with the specified resource.

At column 10, line 25 to column 11, line 5 of Edlund, the user specifies the user ID (resource) and submits a query (relation). Nothing in the cited portion teaches or suggests that the query is configured for the user ID, or that the query is associated with the user ID. Rather the query is configured for and is associated with the user who is

submitting the query, and not the person associated with the user ID. At column 8, line 52 to column 9, line 65, the user submits a query (relation) and the label manager automatically generates a label and description for the query. The user does not select the label and description and configure a query for the label and the description. Instead, the label and description are generated for the query after the query has already been configured and submitted.

Accordingly, claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable over Edlund for at least the above reasons. Moreover, independent claims 16, 31, 46, 47 and 48 recite features that are substantially similar to the absent features discussed in conjunction with claim 1, and thus these claims and their respective dependent claims are considered allowable for these same reasons.

Dependent Claims 2, 17 and 32 are Allowable over Edlund.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited document fails to teach or suggest the claimed limitation in claims 2, 17 and 32. Claim 2 recites:

2. The method of claim 1, wherein allowing the user to configure the relation includes:

allowing the user to select a resource type to be returned;

in response to the user's selection, retrieving automatically a template corresponding to the resource type, wherein the template comprises a plurality of parameters associated with the corresponding resource type; and

allowing the user to create the matching criteria utilizing the plurality of parameters, wherein the one or more related resources satisfy the matching criteria.

Claim 17 is a computer readable medium containing program instructions implementing the method of claim 2, and claim 32 is directed to a system for executing the method of claim 2. In this aspect of the claimed invention, the system assists the user in configuring the relation by retrieving a template that corresponds to the resource type the user wants returned. The template includes parameters associated with the resource type that can be used to create the matching criteria of the relation.

Nothing in Edlund describes how the user creates the query. Rather, the user configures the query without assistance from the system. Nonetheless, the Examiner contends that Edlund discloses these features at column 8, line 52 to column 9, line 65. As discussed above with respect to claims 1, 16, 31, 46, 47 and 48, however, the cited portion of Edlund describes the label manager component that automatically generates a label and description for the query based on the query's words and phrases. Nothing in the cited portion teaches or suggests configuring a relation by allowing the user to "select a resource type to be returned," retrieving a "template corresponding to the resource type" that includes "a plurality of parameters," and creating the "matching criteria utilizing the plurality of parameters," as required by claim 2.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2, 17 and 32 are allowable over Edlund.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, entry and favorable consideration of the above amendments and remarks is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned patent attorney at the below-listed number if, after reviewing the above Remarks, the Examiner believes outstanding matters remain that may be resolved without the issuance of a subsequent Official Action.

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, or credit any overpayment, associated with the filing of this paper to Deposit Account No. 50-3512.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 5, 2007

By: /Stephen J. Tytran Reg. No. 45,846/
Stephen J. Tytran
Registration No. 45,846

Customer No: 49278
111 Corning Road; Ste. 220
Cary, North Carolina 27518
919 233 1942 x202 (voice)
919 233 9907 (fax)